

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
AUSTIN DIVISION**

**GEORGE JONES #1436799,**  
**Plaintiff,**

**-vs-**

**Case No. A-08-CA-788-SS**

**SERGEANT RUIZ,**  
**Defendant.**

---

**ORDER**

BE IT REMEMBERED on this day the Court reviewed the file in the above-styled cause, and specifically the “Motion to Subpoena Discovery Response from Defendant” filed September 16, 2009; “Motion to Subpoena Discovery Response from Defendant” filed September 16, 2009; “Motions to Amend” filed September 16, 2009; and plaintiff’s “Motion to Discover to Defendant” filed October 28, 2009, and further noting that for whatever reason the Attorney General representing the defendant in the above-captioned matter has failed to reply to any of these motions and, therefore, under the local rules of this District, the motions are granted as not disputed, and the Court enters the following:

In the plaintiff’s “Motion to Subpoena Discovery Response from Defendant” filed September 16, 2009, he alleges the defendant has not complied with the discovery order of this Court on June 27, 2009. Therefore, IT IS ORDERED that the defendant SHOW CAUSE why he has not complied with this Court’s discovery order or file an appropriate pleading showing he has complied with the order of this Court.

In the “Motion to Subpoena Discovery Response from Defendant” filed September 16, 2009, the plaintiff alleges he served discovery on the defendant Ruiz on July 7, 2009, and has not received any answers to the discovery and requests answers to each of the questions submitted to the defendant Ruiz. There being no opposition to this motion, IT IS ORDERED that the defendant immediately answer every discovery request submitted bearing the date of July 7, 2009, to the plaintiff and file a pleading to show cause why this has not been done or a pleading clearly establishing that this discovery has been completely answered.

Regarding the Motions to Amend, and there being no opposition to the same, the plaintiff’s Motions to Amend is GRANTED with the addition of all new causes of action, the additional defendants of Robert D. Pittman at the Office of Inspector General; Shane Bennett, an employee at the Travis State Jail Unit; Viviana Martinez, an employee of the Travis State Jail Unit; William Hughs; Angelica Dumaran, an employee at the Travis State Jail Unit; and one unknown defendant. Of course, the plaintiff Jones must appropriately serve process on each of the defendants, if they are to become parties to this lawsuit.

Finally, the plaintiff filed a motion to obtain the original incident report filed by the defendant Ruiz concerning the incident involving the plaintiff on June 22, 2008; a copy of the minute reports with the defendant Ruiz and his supervisors pertaining to the incident on June 22, 2008; all reports, statements, supervisory minutes, disciplinary actions (temporary and permanent), and the date of the malicious assault and abuse by the defendant Ruiz “on this latest handcuffed victim.” There being no response to the same, the defendant Ruiz is so ORDERED to produce those documents to the plaintiff Jones.

Each of these pleadings clearly establish a certificate whereby the Attorney General was forwarded a copy of these pleadings and for whatever reason unknown to the undersigned and to the world in general and in particular to the defendant Ruiz, the Attorney General has filed no responses nor objections nor explanations.

IT IS SO ORDERED this the 9<sup>th</sup> day of November 2009.

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE